

asked that he might be heard in the matter before more was said on either side.

This was agreed to and Mr. Hartley took the platform amid considerable applause. The Presbytery of Maitland, he said, was not seeking notoriety in this matter and they had waited until the last moment, hoping some other body would move in the matter, and it was not until it had become known that they had moved that Montreal took it up. It was the feeling in Maitland that Montreal should have taken up the matter sooner, and all that Maitland Presbytery asked now was that definite action should be taken, and that without delay, for a very strong feeling existed upon the question, not only in his vicinity, but, he was assured, throughout the country. The Assembly appointed its professors; it should be prepared to say, "Stop!" to them when their teachings were out of harmony with those of the Church. He would not say that any of their emolument or privileges as ministers should be curtailed, but they should not continue to scatter broadcast the doctrines which the Church disapproved and disavowed.

Dr. McRae again rose to his point of order. They were not then trying Prof. Campbell, and it was not fair to allow any member of Assembly to speak thus at this time. (Hear, hear.)

The Moderator hoped the brethren would not insist too closely upon such points of order. He did not think the speaker was out of order so far. (Applause.)

Rev. Angus McKay, Lucknow, the other commissioner charged to support the overture before the Assembly, quoted from the lecture in support of the contentions that it contained objectionable doctrines. These quotations were as follows: "Neither Christ nor His apostles will allow us to follow the typical Old Testament God. We are not to tremble as slaves before His iron, but to rise unto an atmosphere of peace and confidence, hearing Him say, 'Fear not, it is I.' If in the writings of the Hebrew fathers we meet a spirit of fear, of deceit, of anger, of cursing, of revenge, we are to try the spirits, whether they be of God, since many false spirits are gone out into the world. How can we try them? Here it is, 'Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.' Note this, 'That Jesus Christ is come,'—not Moses, nor David, nor Isaiah, nor Paul, nor John—although God spoke by all these men. Take away the right to search the Scriptures, to test Scripture by Scripture, to try the spirits, and the Bible is a house divided against itself. The infallible teaching of Christ reveals the fallibility of preceding teachers. Christ did not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them by fulfilling their moral enactments to the higher, all-embracing law of love, by emphasizing sin and its reward, and by giving a grander view of God than all they had attained. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Again, why did the chronicler of the books called Samuel say that God tempted David to number Israel, and he of the Chronicles impute the act to Satan? Because they were free to view the act from their own standpoint. There can be no doubt which is the more truthful. The divine perfections set forth in the New Testament declare the untruthfulness of the statement in Samuel. Again, such men ask what neither revelation, reason, nor the analogy of the faith gives them a right to demand, when they seek a sent to the proposition that the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelations were in the original manuscripts infallibly void of all error."

"Here," added Mr. McKay, in comment on the last quotation, "is one of the very points upon which Dr. Briggs was suspended."

Mr. Walter Paul, Montreal, explained more fully the action of the Presbytery there. Although the lecture was delivered in February, it really did not become public property until published from the author's revision on May 11. As soon as it was thus published, they at once took action, and he assured the Assembly that they had lost no time since, but had done everything consistent with the laws of the Church.

Rev. Dr. Campbell, Clerk of the Assembly, moved the receipt of the overture and its reference to the Montreal Presbytery. Rev. Mr. Hartley seconded this proposal.

Principal MacVicar thought it was superfluous to refer an overture from one Presbytery to another. He had been questioned by many because of his silence on this question, but he was prepared to speak at the proper time and place, but, that he might not be misunderstood, he would say here: "I abide in the old way." (Loud applause.)

Rev. Kenneth McLennan, Point Levis, Que., thought the matter was entirely one of procedure. He would suggest a minute to the effect that the overture was received, and the statement made that Montreal was giving the matter proper attention, and, therefore, the Assembly was satisfied to leave it in their hands.

Dr. Laing seconded this proposal. They

had, he was sure, perfect confidence in Montreal. The removal of professors rested with the Assembly, however, and could be made with or without cause. Mr. Paul had said that Prof. Campbell was beloved in his Presbytery and college, and he would add that he was beloved greatly outside. It was contended that steps should be taken to prevent a repetition of such teaching. (Applause.) All he could say was that, if Montreal decided to leave him in the chair, there would be good reason for so doing.

Principal Forrest suggested the desirability of unanimity in arriving at a decision, and urged the withdrawal of some of the amendments or their fusion.

Dr. Campbell and Mr. Hartley agreed, provided Maitland was not blamed for their action.

Dr. A. B. McKay, Montreal: As a member of Montreal Presbytery, I thank you for bringing the matter before this Assembly. (Hear, hear.)

A member asked whether it would be possible, if the Assembly took no definite action, that Prof. Campbell continue his teachings, for, if he did, it would weaken the power of every pulpit in the land.

Rev. John Somerville, Owen Sound, thought the only way to stop the teachings was to suspend the teacher. Every member of the Assembly would be sorry to endorse the professor's teachings.

Principal MacVicar pointed out the rule in the Church blue book which empowered the Presbytery to take definite action and suspend any professor if full investigation required it. The Presbytery of Montreal would meet on July 11 to receive the report of the committee already appointed to examine Prof. Campbell, and from then until Oct. 1, when the college would re-open, there would be plenty of time to decide on final action.

Mr. George Hay, Ottawa, spoke of the deep anxiety which existed in every section of the Church in all parts of the Dominion, concerning this case, and the suspense with which the treatment of the member would be awarded.

Principal MacVicar again rose and remarked that he quite agreed with the contention that the Assembly had every power to deal with Prof. Campbell's position under the constitution, and that is why he had been careful to say that he would oppose no proposal to take constitutional action.

Rev. Geo. Bruce, St. John, N. B., declared that he was satisfied the Assembly was seized of two things, first, confidence in the Montreal Presbytery and also that the feeling existed which had been referred to by Mr. Hay. It was most desirable that the people be given to understand that the Assembly was deeply concerned in the teachings of her colleges and it would, therefore, be well that it be understood that the fathers and brethren fully participated in the apprehension expressed in the overture.

Rev. G. Munro, Harriston, felt that in proposing to leave the matter to the Montreal Presbytery they were getting over it altogether too easily. (Hear, hear.) Such action would not allay the anxious feeling which had been spoken of. Definite action should have been taken two years ago, for the delay had resulted in those questioned utterances becoming now almost defiant. He moved in amendment that the overture be received and a committee appointed to examine Dr. Campbell's published letter complained of therein and recommend a course of action to the Assembly in the premises. He would ask leave to name the committee, and in so doing would keep out those interested in the denominational colleges, for then possibly the people would have more confidence in its finding. (Laughter.) The Committee was as follows:—Dr. MacDonald, Seaforth; Dr. Burson, St. Catharines; Dr. McKay, Woodstock; Rev. J. Somerville, Owen Sound; Rev. Kenneth McLennan, Point Levis; Rev. Geo. Bruce, St. John, and Rev. Dr. D. H. Fletcher, Hamilton.

Dr. Fraser seconded the proposal, and Messrs. Geo. Hay, Ottawa, and John Charlton, M. P., were added to the committee. This was accepted by the proposer.

Mr. Hamilton Cassels, Toronto, asked if it was the intention for this committee to proceed with its investigation in the absence of and without hearing Prof. Campbell. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Munro replied that it would be better to see what the committee recommended before deciding whether to cite Prof. Campbell to appear before them.

Mr. Robert Roe, Thedford, endorsed the amendment, but he feared that if the professor appeared before the Presbytery and expressed regret, the Presbytery might forgive and reinstate. These heresies were getting altogether too frequent. They had caused trouble and divisions in many other sections of the Church, and it was time the Assembly met the difficulty with a firm and stern hand.

The Moderator interposed a hope that subsequent speakers would be very careful and not give utterance to unguarded remarks in further discussion.

Dr. MacDonald, Seaforth, had much fear

and trembling in accepting the position of convener of the proposed committee. For he feared the spirit of the Assembly would judge the accused first and try him afterwards. This tendency must be guarded against. It might be taken for granted that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada was sound in the faith, and was prepared to defend it at all costs, and do justice to all. He desired to point out that it was dangerous to interfere with the constitution of the Church, and it would be plenty of time to talk to the Montreal Presbytery when they showed signs of cowardice. He endorsed the contention that it was unfair to take up the matter in Prof. Campbell's absence. He would propose that a committee be appointed to prepare a deliverance upon the order of procedure, and not go into the merits of the case at all.

Rev. Dr. McRae, of Collingwood, desired to say a word of explanation on the point of order he had previously raised. As a student of Prof. Campbell, he claimed a fair trial for the man he loved and revered. To discuss the case here, and still put it in the hands of Montreal Presbytery, was to try him twice, and with no unprejudiced spirit apparently, and such a course made his British sense of fair play rebel. He trusted they would take a lesson from the action of the American Assembly, and move very slowly and cautiously.

J. C. Eckford, Dunkeld, thought that while the Assembly was ready to give Prof. Campbell every opportunity to clear himself, they should insist upon his refraining from teaching in the meantime.

Rev. Dr. McKay, Woodstock, spoke briefly.

Principal Forrest, Halifax, said the committee's proposal was a very nice way to arrange the matter; but it would do no good if any departure was made from the established laws of the Church. If there was anything in this matter at which the world would jump with glee, it would be any attempt to reach a conclusion with greater haste than their constitution allowed. The outside world raised a great hue and cry on the other side of the line that Dr. Briggs had not been given a fair trial. He did not believe this was true, but still that was what was said. The committee proposed by Mr. Munro was most manifestly a one-sided committee. He warned the Assembly that they would gain nothing by losing their heads. He was in thorough sympathy with much that had been said; but he would emphasize the warning which had been given to make haste slowly.

Rev. Principal Caven remarked that if the case had been up for discussion upon its merits, he would not have spoken, but the resolution referred to the mode of procedure. He had the fullest confidence in the Assembly, but he beseeched them to be extremely careful to guard personal rights. He urged them to go slowly. A great body like this could afford to move cautiously. Of two things all might rest assured—first, that no unsound doctrine would be tolerated by that Assembly, and secondly, that when a brother falls under suspicion his personal rights would be conserved. He deprecated Mr. Munro's proposal. He beseeched the Assembly not to appoint a committee just at this juncture to examine that lecture, because the impression would go abroad that they were passing final judgment, and if eventually they had to do so it was essential that they have a clean record up to date. He begged, therefore, to move, "That the General Assembly, deeply impressed with the importance of the matter which has been brought before it by the overture of the Presbytery of Maitland, and sincerely alive to the importance of sound teaching in all the schools, commends the zeal of the Presbytery in the action it has taken; but, inasmuch as the General Assembly learns that the case is under the consideration of the Presbytery of Montreal, decides to take no action, but allow the Presbytery to proceed in the constitutional way in dealing with it."

Rev. George Bruce, St. John, N. B., seconded; and President Forrest, suggesting the withdrawal of the other motions, Messrs. Munro and McLennan acquiesced, and Dr. Caven's amendment became the substantive motion, and was carried without further discussion.

Dr. Cochran reported on behalf of the committee appointed to arrange for the services in the Assembly church, as follows:—11 a. m., Rev. D. M. Gordon, B. D., Halifax; 3.30 p. m., communion service, the Moderator to preside, assisted by Principal Caven and Dr. John Thompson, Sarnia; 7 p. m., Rev. John G. Paton, New Hebrides, delegate from the Australian Assembly.

The Assembly adjourned at 6 o'clock for supper.

At 7.30 the Assembly was again constituted, and at once proceeded to the consideration of the Home Mission reports. The report of the Eastern Section was

presented in an eloquent and comprehensive address by Rev. John McMillan, of Halifax, N. S., convener of the council.

Rev. John Robbins, Truro, seconded the adoption of the report, and the motion prevailed.

Rev. George Bruce, St. John, N. B., moved, and Rev. George McMillan, Prince-town, P. E. I., seconded the adoption of the report of the Eastern Section Augmentation Report, which was accepted.

The report of the Home Mission Board of the Western Section was presented by Dr. Cochran, of Brantford, and supported by Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, of Toronto, and adopted.

The Western Augmentation Report was submitted by Rev. Principal Grant of Kingston and Rev. Dr. R. N. Grant, of Orillia, and supported by Rev. Dr. Robertson, of Winnipeg and Rev. P. D. Langill, of Vernon, B. C.

This report was also adopted, and the Assembly adjourned at 10.30 p. m.

Before taking up the first order of the day, leave was given Rev. Dr. A. B. McKay, Montreal, to introduce the report of those delegates who represented the Canadian General Assembly at the jubilee of the Free Church of Scotland last summer. Dr. Mackay gave an interesting account of the proceedings, making a special reference to the strong and growing indications of approaching reunion between the Free Church and the Established Church of Scotland, and quoting the reciprocal resolutions passed by both of the General Assemblies looking towards an ultimate fusion. The statement was attentively listened to, and at its conclusion a warm vote of thanks was accorded Dr. Mackay and his co-delegates for their services.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Rev. Dr. W. D. Armstrong, of Ottawa, the convener of the Sabbath Observance Committee, then presented the report of the committee in a clear, forceful speech.

Mr. John Charlton, M. P., moved the reception of the report, the thanking of the committee, and the consideration of the recommendations of the report serially. In prefacing his remarks, Mr. Charlton spoke eulogistically of the services of Dr. Armstrong, convener of the Sabbath Observance Committee. Turning to the general subject matter under consideration, the speaker referred to the divine institution of the Sabbath, and its essential influence upon the very continuance of Christianity, quoting from infidel writers to show the importance they attached to the breaking down of its observance. The legislation which had been proposed, and which he had had much to do in promulgating, had been a good deal misunderstood; he had never proposed to compel men to go to church or to interfere with his liberty of conscience, but if it would be an outrage to attempt this it would be an equal outrage to prevent a man from resting from labor and observing the Sabbath as he might desire in worshipping God. The only excuse for all legislation was the necessities of the people, and upon that ground only he and those with him had urged, and would continue to urge, legislation along these lines. Why were the shores of time strewn with the wreck of empires, why had Rome, Babylon and Nineveh passed away? The wages of sin were death, and these nations had earned and received their recompense and reward. The working man, if he understood his interests aright, demanded a change in this matter. It had been noted by those best able to observe and judge that those who received the dividends favored Sabbath labor, while those who earned the dividends opposed it. Then it was declared that these laws would be an infringement of personal liberty; so then in the same sense were the laws against obscene literature, against murder, stealing or perjury. The state, too took cognisance of educational and social interests, and what interest was more essential or important than this?

Then this law recognized the rights of conscience and religious liberty. These rights were among the most cherished in the British constitution. It gave a man the opportunity to attend church with his family; it would assist in building up good homes which were, as Daniel Webster had said, the bulwarks of the state; it assisted in diminishing crime; it promoted the cause of temperance better than any prohibition act would do. And lastly, it would make for the advancement of the prosperity of the state more than any other legislation conceivable.

THE CHICAGO FAIR.

Turning to the reference in the report to the efforts to close the Chicago Fair, Mr. Charlton quoted the resolution on the question submitted in the Canadian Parliament, and the remarks upon the matter by Hon. G. E. Foster, as leader of the House, strongly condemning the action of the Government in shelving the motion by adjourning the debate on the last available day of the session. The battle around the gates of the fair continued, however, but the effects of the godlessness